IN THE CLAIMS

Claim amendments and status:

1. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a screen that displays video content[,] for a game of chance, wherein all of the video content for a different game of chance is [being] automatically reconfigured in response to a trigger.

2. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 1, wherein the trigger is a wagered amount.

3. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 1, wherein the trigger is an identity of a player.

4. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 1, wherein the trigger is a speed at which a game is played.

5. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a screen that displays video content[,] for a game of chance, wherein all of the video content for a different game of chance is [being] reconfigurable by a casino.

6. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a screen that displays video content[,] for a game of chance, wherein all of the video content for a different game of chance is [being] reconfigurable by a player.

7. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a screen that displays video content[,] for a game of chance, wherein all of the video content for a different game of chance is [being] automatically reconfigured at a predetermined time.

8. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a plurality of screens that display video content[,] for a game of chance, wherein all of the video content for a different game of chance is [being] remotely reconfigurable.

9. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content is reconfigurable through a network.

10. (Currently amended) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content of one of the screens comprises [a] the video content of an entire different game.

11. (Currently amended) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content of one of the plurality of screens comprises a pay table, and the video content of at least one of the remaining plurality of screens comprises the video content of an entire different game.

12. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content of one of the screens comprises artwork representative of a theme of a game played on the gaming machine.

13. (Currently amended) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content of one of the screen comprises a primary game, and the video content of at least one of the remaining plurality of screens comprises the video content of a secondary game.

14. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content is automatically reconfigured in response to a trigger.

15. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 14, wherein the trigger is a wagered amount.

16. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 14, wherein the trigger is an identity of a player.

17. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 14, wherein the trigger is a speed at which a game is played.

18. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content is reconfigurable by a casino.

19. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content is reconfigurable at the request of a player.

20. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 8, wherein the video content is automatically reconfigured at a predetermined time.

21. (Withdrawn) A plurality of gaming machines, comprising:

a network to which each gaming machine is attached, each gaming machine having a screen that displays a game, the game content being downloadable from the network.

22. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 21, wherein the game is automatically downloaded in response to a trigger.

23. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 22, wherein the trigger is a wagered amount.

24. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 22, wherein the trigger is an identity of a player.

25. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 22, wherein the trigger is a speed at which a game is played.

26. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 21, wherein the game is downloadable by a casino.

27. (Withdrawn) The gaming machine as recited in claim 21, wherein the video content is automatically downloaded at a predetermined time.

28. (Withdrawn) A plurality of gaming machines, comprising:

a network to which each gaming machine is attached, each gaming machine having a screen that displays artwork representative of a theme of a game played on the gaming machine, wherein artwork representative of a theme of a different game played on the gaming machine is being downloadable from the network

29. (Withdrawn) A plurality of gaming machines, comprising:

a network to which each gaming machine is attached, each gaming machine having a screen that displays a secondary game, the secondary game content being downloadable from the network.

30. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a first video display displaying a first game;

a second video display displaying pay tables associated with the first game; and

a third video display displaying artwork associated with the first game;

wherein a second game is downloadable to the three video displays [being] that are reconfigurable so that the [a] second game is displayed on the reconfigured first video display, pay tables associated with the second game are displayed on the reconfigured second video display, and artwork associated with the second game is displayed on the reconfigured third video display.

31. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 30, wherein the video displays are automatically reconfigured in response to a trigger.

32. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 31, wherein the trigger is a wagered amount.

33. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 31, wherein the trigger is an identity of a player.

34. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 31, wherein the trigger is a speed at which a game is played.

35. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 30, wherein the video displays are reconfigurable by a casino.

36. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 30, wherein the video displays are reconfigurable at the request of a player.

37. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 30, wherein the video displays are automatically reconfigured at a predetermined time.

38. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a first video display displaying a first game; and

a second video display displaying information relating to the first game;

the gaming machine being reconfigurable so that a second game is displayed on the reconfigured first video display and information relating to the second game is displayed on the reconfigured second video display.

39. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 38, wherein the video displays are automatically reconfigured in response to a trigger.

40. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 39, wherein the trigger is a wagered amount.

41. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 39, wherein the trigger is an identity of a player.

42. (Original) The gaming machine, as recited in claim 39, wherein the trigger is a speed at which a game is played.

43. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 38, wherein the video displays are reconfigurable by a casino.

44. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 38, wherein the video displays are reconfigurable at the request of a player.

45. (Original) The gaming machine as recited in claim 38, wherein the video displays are automatically reconfigured at a predetermined time.

46. (Currently amended) A method of displaying video content for a game on a gaming machine having a plurality of screens, comprising:

displaying video content for a first game; and

remotely reconfiguring the video content from the first game into the reconfigured video content for a second game.

47. (Withdrawn) A method of displaying video content on a plurality of gaming machines, comprising:

attaching a network to the plurality of gaming machines; and

downloading the video content from the network.

48. (Currently amended) A method of displaying video content on a gaming machine, the video content including a game, paytables associated with the game, and artwork associated with the game, the method comprising:

displaying a first game on a first video display;

displaying pay tables associated with the first game on a second video display;

displaying artwork associated with the first game on a third video display; and

reconfiguring the video content on the three video displays for a second game so that the [a] second game is displayed on the first video display, pay tables associated with the second game are displayed on the second video display, and artwork associated with the second game is displayed on the third video display.

49. (Currently amended) A method of displaying video content on a gaming machine, comprising:

displaying a first game on a first video display;

displaying information relating to the first game on a second video display; and

reconfiguring the video content on the gaming machine so that a second game is displayed on the first video display and [that] information relating to the second game is displayed on the second video display.

50. (Currently amended) A gaming machine, comprising:

a screen that displays video content for a game, wherein all of the video content for a first game is [being] reconfigurable into the video content for a second game using locally stored video content.

51. (Withdrawn) A method of verifying a game file, comprising:

providing gaming regulators with an electronic version of the game files via a network.

52. (Withdrawn) The method, as recited in claim 51, wherein the file is in a .bmp format.

53. (Withdrawn) The method, as recited in claim 51, wherein the file is in a .jpg format.

54. (Withdrawn) The method, as recited in claim 51, wherein the file is in .avi format.

55. (Withdrawn) The method, as recited in claim 51, wherein the electronic version of the game files includes a hash of the game files.

56. (Withdrawn) A gaming system, comprising:

a server process that can communicate with a client process, which is located within an operating system, and wherein the server process can also communicate with a client process over a network.

57. (New) A reconfigurable gaming machine for playing games, each game having game content, the gaming machine comprising:

a screen that displays the game content, and

a processor that runs the game content;

wherein all of the game content for a first game is reconfigurable into the game content for a second game using locally stored game content.

58. (New) A reconfigurable gaming machine for playing games, each game having game content, the gaming machine comprising:

a screen that displays the game content, and

a processor that runs the game content;

wherein all of the game content for a first game is reconfigurable into the game content for a second game using downloadable game content.

59. (New) A gaming machine for playing one of a plurality of games, each game including video content and game logic content, the gaming machine comprising:

a screen that displays the video content for the games, and

a processor that runs the game logic content for the games;

wherein, in response to identification of a player by the gaming machine, the video content and game logic content of the gaming machine are reconfigured to a predetermined game associated with that particular player.

Claims Rejections

1. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Claims 1-3, and 6

Claims 1, 3, and 6 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Acres. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to provide clarification only, independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. For brevity, only the basis for the rejection of independent claims 1 and 6 are traversed in detail on the understanding that dependent claim 3 is also patentably distinct over the prior art as it depends directly from claim 1. Nevertheless, dependent claim 3 includes additional features that, in combination with those of claim 1, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Examiner states that Acres discloses automatically reconfiguring his system during idle time at Col. 1, line 65 - Col. 2, line 9. However, closer analysis reveals that Acres is using the term "reconfigure" merely to describe providing an additional bonus, such as a double jackpot to the player during off-peak hours. See Col. 2 lines 6-12. The abstract of the Acres patent further clarifies that the Acres patent is narrowly directed towards a gaming device that "reconfigures its payout schedule responsive to the reconfiguration commands to provide a variety of promotional bonuses such as multiple jackpot bonuses, mystery jackpot bonuses, progressive jackpot bonuses, player specific jackpot bonuses." See Abstract. (emphasis added).

In contrast, the claimed invention of the present application is directed towards reconfiguring an entire game on a gaming machine, not merely modifying a bonus award. Specifically claims 1, 3, and 6 include reconfiguring "all of the video content for a different game of chance." Reconfiguring a gaming machine to display an entirely different game is a much more complicated process having inherently greater associated challenges and difficulties, than the mere altering of a bonus (as in the Acres patent). As such, the alterable bonus feature of the Acres patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine that is reconfigurable to display an entirely different game, as claimed in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, and 6 has been overcome.

2. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b) – Claims 5, 7, and 50

Claims 5, 7, and 50 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pease et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,102). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to provide clarification only, independent claims 5, 7, and 50 have been amended.

The Examiner states that Pease discloses a system capable of downloading data to a gaming terminal during idle time at Col. 6, line 34-67. The Examiner further states that the Pease patent discloses having personnel physically walking from terminal to terminal to proceed with the downloading process. See Col. 2 lines 6-12. However, closer analysis reveals that, although the Pease patent does discuss downloading information from an external information source to a gaming terminal, the gaming terminal is merely a hub for that information to be transmitted to one or more peripheral devices (e.g., bill acceptor, coin acceptor, and the like). It is those peripheral devices that are then reconfigured using the downloaded information, not the gaming terminals themselves. See Abstract; Col. 6, line 34-67.

Thus, the Pease patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which "all of the video content for a different game of chance is automatically reconfigurable by a casino," as in amended claim 5. The Pease patent also does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which "all of the video content for a different game of chance is reconfigured at a predetermined time," as in amended claim 7. Further, the Pease patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which "all of the video content for a first game is reconfigurable into the video content for a second game using locally stored video content," as in amended claim 50.

Briefly stated, the Pease patent teaches a system for reconfiguring peripheral devices, not a gaming machine that is reconfigurable to display an entirely different game, as claimed in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 5, 7, and 50 has been overcome.

3. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claim 4

Claim 4 is pending in the present application and was rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the single reference of Acres, even though the Examiner admits that Acres does not disclose the concept of a "[reconfiguration] trigger being a speed at which a game is played." Instead, the Examiner merely opines, "setting the [reconfiguration] trigger to be a speed at which a game is played would have been a matter of design choice." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Examiner has cited no reference supporting this position.

Respectfully, the Examiner's assertion that "setting the [reconfiguration] trigger to be a speed at which a game is played would have been a matter of design choice" is completely unsupported by the art of record. The Examiner has cited no less than five different references in the current Office Action, yet has not asserted that any of them support his position that "setting the [reconfiguration] trigger to be a speed at which a game is played would have been a matter of design choice." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion by the Examiner and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Otherwise, an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on his own opinion as to what is common knowledge and well known in an art as a matter of design choice without any supporting references, after the Applicant has challenged the Examiner's assertion. MPEP. 2144.03.

Additionally, Applicant further notes that dependent claim 4 depends directly from independent claim 1, and thus, is also patentably distinct over the prior art for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 4 has been overcome.

4. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claim 2

Claim 2 is pending in the present application and was rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acres in view of Weiss (U.S. Patent No. 6,142,873). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

While the Examiner admits that the Acres patent does not disclose the concept of reconfiguring a game machine in response to a wagered amount, the Examiner states that the Weiss patent discloses a gaming device "allowing a player to enable a second display when a maximum bet is inserted." That is, in the gaming device of the Weiss patent, a player is only eligible for a prize that enables a second display, if the player has wagered the maximum bet allowed (i.e., the player is playing the "max bet"). Respectfully, the Weiss patent and the Acres patent, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest automatically reconfiguring all of the video content for a different game of chance in response to the trigger of a wagered amount, as recited by claim 2.

First, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only adding an additional game of chance via a second display. Second, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest using a "wagered amount" as a reconfiguration trigger, but rather merely discloses a gaming device in which a player is only eligible for a prize that enables a second display, if the player has wagered the maximum bet allowed. Thus, in the Weiss gaming device the second display is activated by a random event (i.e., achieving a particular winning symbol in the primary game of chance). In contrast, claim 2 of the present application requires the reconfiguration trigger for a game to be a wagered amount, which is completely controlled by the player. Nor does Acres suggest using a wager amount as the trigger for reconfiguring an initial game into an entirely different game.

Additionally, Applicant further notes that dependent claim 2 depends directly from independent claim 1, and thus, is also patentably distinct over the prior art for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 2 has been overcome.

5. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 8-14, 16-17, 20, and 45-46

Claims 8-14, 16-17, 20, and 45-46 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hedrick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,135,884) in view of Acres. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to provide clarification only, independent claims 8 and 46 have been amended. Claims 9-14, 16-17, and 20 depend from independent claim 8. Claim 45 depends from independent claim 38. For brevity, only the basis for the rejection of independent claims is traversed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Although the Examiner states that the Hedrick patent discloses a plurality of video displays, he admits that the Hedrick patent fails to disclose reconfiguring the system remotely. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Acres patent discloses a network system capable of being reconfigured remotely. However, as discussed above in Section 1, closer analysis reveals that the Acres patent is using the term "reconfigure" merely to describe modifying a jackpot. See Col. 2 lines 6-12. The abstract of the Acres patent further clarifies that the Acres patent is narrowly directed towards a gaming device that only modifies its payout schedule. See Abstract. In contrast, the claimed invention of the present application is directed towards reconfiguring an entire game on a gaming machine. Specifically claims 8-14, 16-17, 20, and 46 require that "all of the video content for a different game of chance be remotely reconfigurable." Further, the Hedrick patent does not fulfill the shortcomings of the Acres patent.

Additionally, with respect to claim 17, the Examiner's assertion that "setting the [reconfiguration] trigger to be a speed at which a game is played would have been a matter of design choice," is completely unsupported by the art of record. As stated above in Section 3, five different references have been cited in the current Office Action, yet none of them have been cited as supporting this assertion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion and formally request that the Examiner provide reference(s) in support of this assertion. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 8-14, 16-17, 20, and 45-46 has been overcome.

6. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 15 and 19

Claims 15 and 19 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hedrick et al. in view of Acres, and further in view of Weiss. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that the Hedrick and Acres patents fail to disclose (1) a wager amount being used as a reconfiguration trigger and (2) the video content being reconfigurable at the request of a player. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Weiss patent a gaming device "allowing a player to enable a second display when a maximum bet is inserted." That is, in the gaming device of the Weiss patent, a player is only eligible for a prize that enables a second display, if the player has wagered the maximum bet allowed (i.e., the player is playing the "max bet"). However, as discussed above in Section 4, closer analysis reveals that the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only adding an additional game of chance in another display upon the occurrence of a predetermined random event, i.e., a particular prize being won when a player has made a maximum bet.

Further, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest using a "wagered amount" as a reconfiguration trigger, but rather merely discloses a gaming device in which a player becomes eligible for a prize that enables a second display, when the player wagers the maximum bet allowed (i.e., the player is playing the "max bet"). Thus, in the Weiss gaming device the bonus display is still activated by a random event (i.e., achieving a particular winning symbol in the primary game of chance). In contrast, the claimed invention of the present application requires the reconfiguration trigger for a game to be a wagered amount, which is completely controlled by the player.

Moreover, the Hedrick and Acres patents still suffer from the same shortcomings discussed above in Section 5. Applicant notes that dependent claims 15 and 19 depend from independent claim 8, and thus, are also patentably distinct over the prior art for the reasons stated above in Section 5 with respect to claim 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 15 and 19 has been overcome.

7. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claim 18

Claim 18 is pending in the present application and was rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedrick et al. in view of Acres, and further in view of the Pease et al. patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that the Hedrick and Acres patents fail to disclose reconfiguring the video content by the casino. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Pease patent discloses that a casino operator can set up the reconfiguration process by downloading data during idle time. However, as discussed above in Section 2, closer analysis reveals that the Pease patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only reconfiguring peripheral devices, such as bill acceptors.

Moreover, as discussed above in Section 1, the Acres patent does not teach or suggest reconfiguring of a game of chance, but rather reconfiguring only a jackpot (bonus award). In contrast, the claimed invention of the present application is directed towards reconfiguring an entire game on a gaming machine. Claim 18 (which depends from independent claim 1) requires a gaming machine in which "all of the video content for a different game of chance is automatically reconfigurable." Further, the Hedrick patent also does not fulfill the shortcomings of the Pease patent and the Acres patent, since it has only been cited for the disclosure of a plurality of video displays.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the combination of the Hedrick, Acres, and Pease patents does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which "all of the video content for a different game of chance is automatically reconfigurable," as required by claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 18 has been overcome.

8. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 30 and 48

Claims 30 and 48 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over ITEM in view of the Hedrick et al. patent. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner states that the Hedrick patent discloses a system with two video displays, where one video display shows a game, and the additional video display contains information directly associated with game play. The Hedrick patent still suffers from the same shortcomings discussed above in Section 3, namely, that Hedrick merely discloses a system with two video displays, and not a video display that is reconfigurable to display an entirely different game.

Regarding the ITEM reference, in the attached 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit (See Attachment A), Applicant swears behind the ITEM reference. That is, the ITEM reference is not prior art to the claimed invention of the present application, since the claimed invention was invented before the priority date of the ITEM reference.

Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which multiple video displays are reconfigurable to display an entirely different game, as claimed by claims 30 and 48 in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 30 and 48 has been overcome.

9. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 31, 33-34, and 37

Claims 31, 33-34, and 37 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over ITEM in view of Hedrick, and further in view of Acres. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that the ITEM reference in view of Hedrick fails to discloses that the automatic reconfiguration takes place in response to a trigger. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Acres patent discloses automatically reconfiguring a trigger during idle time. Again, as explained in the attached 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit (See Attachment A), Applicant swears behind the ITEM reference. As such, the ITEM reference is not prior art to the claimed invention. Additionally, the Hedrick and Acres patents still suffer from the same shortcomings

discussed above in Section 5, namely, that Hedrick merely discloses a system with two video displays, and that Acres does not teach or suggest reconfiguring of a game of chance, but rather reconfiguring only a jackpot (bonus award).

Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which video displays are automatically reconfigurable in response to a trigger, as claimed by claims 31, 33-34, and 37 in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 31, 33-34, and 37 has been overcome.

10. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 32 and 36

Claims 32 and 36 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over ITEM in view of Hedrick and Acres, and further in view of Weiss. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that the ITEM reference in view of Hedrick and Acres, fails to disclose a reconfigurable gaming machine in which the reconfiguration trigger is a wagered amount. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Weiss patent discloses allowing a player to enable a second display when a maximum bet is inserted. Regarding the ITEM reference, as explained in the attached 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit (See Attachment A), Applicant swears behind the ITEM reference. As such, the ITEM reference is not prior art to the claimed invention of the present application. Additionally, the Hedrick and Acres patents still suffer from the same shortcomings discussed above in Section 5, namely, that Hedrick merely discloses a system with two video displays, and that Acres does not teach or suggest reconfiguring of a game of chance, but rather reconfiguring only a jackpot (bonus award).

Regarding the Weiss patent, Weiss does not teach or suggest automatically reconfiguring all of the video content for a different game of chance in response to the trigger of a wagered amount. First, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only adding an additional game of chance in another display. Second, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest using a "wagered amount" as a reconfiguration trigger, but

rather merely discloses a gaming device in which a bonus (second) display becomes eligible as a possible award when a maximum bet has been placed in a game in the first display. Thus, in the Weiss gaming device the bonus display is still activated by a random event (i.e., achieving a particular winning symbol in the primary game of chance). In contrast, claims 32 and 36 of the present application requires the reconfiguration trigger for a game to be a wagered amount, which is completely controlled by the player.

Thus, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which the reconfiguration trigger for a game is the wagered amount, as claimed by claims 32 and 36 in the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 32 and 36 has been overcome.

11. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claim 35

Claim 35 is pending in the present application and was rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over ITEM in view of Hedrick, and further in view of Pease. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner admits that the ITEM reference in view of Hedrick fail to discloses reconfiguring the video content by the casino. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Pease patent discloses that a casino operator can set up the reconfiguration process by downloading data during idle time. Regarding the ITEM reference, as explained in the attached 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit (See Attachment A), Applicant swears behind the ITEM reference. As such, the ITEM reference is not prior art to the claimed invention of the present application. Additionally, the Hedrick patent merely discloses a system with two video displays. Regarding the Pease patent, as discussed above in Section 2, closer analysis reveals that the Pease patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only reconfiguring peripheral devices, such as bill acceptors.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the combination of the prior art does not teach or suggest a gaming machine in which "a second game is downloadable to the three video displays" that are "reconfigurable by a casino," as required by claim 35 (and its independent claim 30).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 35 has been overcome.

12. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 38 and 49

Claims 38 and 49 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the single reference of Hedrick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,102). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to provide clarification only, independent claims 38 and 49 have been amended.

The Examiner states that Hedrick discloses a plurality of video displays and further discloses having his second display containing information directly associated with game play. The Examiner also states that the Hedrick patent discloses having a system with a secondary or bonus game. However, the Hedrick patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine having two video displays initially showing a first game and "being reconfigurable so that a second game is displayed on the reconfigured first video display and information relating to the second game displayed on the reconfigured second video display."

Thus, without the claimed first and second video displays that are reconfigurable to display an entirely different game, the Hedrick patent cannot purport to teach or suggest the claimed invention of claims 38 and 49. Briefly stated, the Hedrick patent does not teach or suggest any type reconfigurable gaming machine whatsoever. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 38 and 49 has been overcome.

13. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 39, 40, 42, 44

Claims 39, 40, 42, and 44 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hedrick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,102) in view of Weiss. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 39, 40, 42, and 44 depend from independent claim 38. Thus, dependent claims 39, 40, 42, and 44 are patentably distinct over the prior art because they depend directly from claim 38. Nevertheless, dependent claims 39, 40, 42, and 44 also include additional

features that, in combination with those of claim 38, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Initially, Applicant notes that the shortcomings of the Hedrick reference (i.e., no teaching or suggesting whatsoever of reconfiguring an entire game) have been discussed above in Section 12. The Examiner admits that the Hedrick patent fails to disclose (1) a wager amount being used as a reconfiguration trigger and (2) the video content being reconfigurable at the request of a player. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Weiss patent discloses a gaming device that allows a player to enable a second display when a maximum bet is inserted.

However, as discussed above in Section 4, closer analysis reveals that the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only adding an additional game of chance in another display upon the occurrence of a predetermined random event, i.e., a particular prize being won when a player has made a maximum bet. Further, the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest using a "wagered amount" as a reconfiguration trigger, but rather merely discloses a gaming device in which a bonus (second) display becomes eligible as a possible award when a maximum bet has been placed in a game in the first display. Thus, in the Weiss gaming device the bonus display is still activated by a random event (i.e., achieving a particular winning symbol in the primary game of chance). In contrast, the claimed of the present application requires the reconfiguration trigger for a game to be a wagered amount, which is completely controlled by the player. Moreover, the rejection of claim 42 for game speed as a reconfiguration trigger being a matter of design choice is traversed for the reasons stated above in Section 3.

Therefore, the combination of the Hedrick patent and the Weiss patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine having two video displays initially showing a first game and "being reconfigurable so that a second game is displayed on the reconfigured first video display and information relating to the second game displayed on the reconfigured second video display." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 39, 40, 42, and 44 has been overcome.

14. Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) – Claims 43

Claim 43 is pending in the present application and was rejected in the Office Action dated March 12, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the single reference of Pease. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 43 depends from independent claim 38. Thus, dependent claim 43 is patentably distinct over the prior art, because it depends directly from claim 38. Nevertheless, dependent claim 43 also includes additional features that, in combination with those of claim 38, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

Initially, Applicant notes that the shortcomings of the Hedrick reference (i.e., no teaching or suggesting whatsoever of reconfiguring an entire game) have been discussed above in Section 12. The Examiner admits that the Hedrick patent fails to disclose reconfiguring the video content by the casino. Nevertheless, the Examiner states that the Pease patent discloses that a casino operator can set up the reconfiguration process by downloading data during idle time. However, as discussed above in Section 2, the Pease patent does not teach or suggest any type of reconfiguring of a game of chance, but only reconfiguring peripheral devices, such as bill acceptors.

Therefore, the combination of the Hedrick patent and the Pease patent does not teach or suggest a gaming machine having two video displays initially showing a first game and "being reconfigurable so that a second game is displayed on the reconfigured first video display and information relating to the second game displayed on the reconfigured second video display." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 43 has been overcome.